

Wednesday, 23rd June, 2021

**Present:**

Councillor Kevin Guy	Leader of the Council, Liberal Democrat Group Leader
Councillor Dine Romero	Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, Communities and Culture
Councillor Tim Ball	Cabinet Member for Planning and Licensing
Councillor Richard Samuel	Deputy Council Leader (statutory) and Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Resources
Councillor Sarah Warren	Deputy Council Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate and Sustainable Travel
Councillor David Wood	Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services
Councillor Tom Davies	Cabinet Member for Adults and Council House Building
Councillor Alison Born	Cabinet Member for Adults and Council House Building
Councillor Manda Rigby	Cabinet Member for Transport

**15 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair (Councillor Kevin Guy) welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The Chair invited all Cabinet Members to introduce themselves.

The Chair also informed the meeting that speakers will have their opportunity to address the Cabinet before questions from public and Councillors.

**16 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Senior Democratic Services Officer drew attention to the evacuation procedure with health and safety notice.

**17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Deputy Monitoring Officer issued an urgent and temporary dispensation of interest declaration for this meeting only to all Members who either live, work or represent their Wards affected by the Active Travel Plans and Liveable Neighbourhoods items in order that those agenda items may be appropriately debated and determined at this Cabinet meeting.

**19 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR**

There was none.

The Chair used this opportunity to read out the following statement:

'Before we move on, I'd like to give an update on the issue of urban gull nuisance.

As many residents know, the rules around gull controls were made much stricter last year. B&NES needed a new licence from Natural England to carry out treatments, including nest and egg removal. We asked residents to help us by supplying evidence in support of our application.

Under the new licence the bar for intervention has been set very high. Controls may only be carried out to preserve public health or safety and as a last resort if non-lethal measures are ineffective.

This means that in most cases, we are not legally allowed to remove nests or eggs, despite the serious problems they cause, including gull attacks and sleep deprivation.

This is clearly unacceptable, and I have written to Natural England to raise our concerns about the impact on residents. We understand that Natural England are willing to listen to feedback from Councils about how they approach this situation next year.

We are calling for a wider programme of treatments to be allowed and for the intervention benchmark to be reassessed for urban gulls. This would enable us to assist more of our long-suffering residents.'

## **20 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

There were 14 questions from Councillors and no questions from members of the public.

*[Copies of the questions and responses, including supplementary questions and responses if any, have been placed on the Minute book as Appendix 1 and are available on the Council's website.]*

## **21 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS**

Fia Heijltjes (6 years old and accompanied by parent) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website*] addressed her concerns with road safety.

David Redgewell made a statement around traffic and bus issues in West of England Combined Authority as per background paper circulated to the Cabinet in advance of the meeting.

Susan Charles in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website*] expressed her concerns about future of parking spaces for Blue Badge holders.

Shiva Page in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website*] expressed a number of concerns related to Equality

Impact Assessments on Clean Air Zone, Liveable Neighbourhoods and Active Travel Schemes.

Martin Grixoni in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website*] said that he was concerned about misplaced priorities, in particular with recycling and refuse collection.

Allison Herbert in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website*] where she highlighted the reasons and benefits of having Bath Christmas Market, and the issues which people mostly complain about , such as access, parking and transport.

Kathryn Davis addressed the Cabinet by supporting Bath Christmas Market as a unique event for local and national visitor experience. Kathryn Davies welcomed the report before the Cabinet by saying that this was an opportunity to deliver an event in 2021 which would provide phenomenal boost to local economy, tourism, and hospitality network.

Charlie Williams said that there would always be those who would be for and against Active Travel Schemes but the Cabinet should stay consistent and continue to combat climate change by trailing and eventually implementing schemes which may not always be popular with all residents.

Jeremy Labram (Chair, Camden Residents' Association) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website*] said that the residents were keen to get into in the Liveable Neighbourhood programme as soon as possible. The association would also like to see the detail of the assessment of the Walcot bid to understand what the project team's misgivings were over complexity and challenge so the residents could start to address those now.

Rachael Hushon in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 8 and on the Council's website*] said that residents who live in the lower Lansdown area were grateful to the Council who have recognised that the Kingsmead area and lower Lansdown needed to be looked at in a joined up way with regards to Liveable neighbourhood planning.

Lynda Lloyd in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 9 and on the Council's website*] said that she was concerned that the creation of Liveable Neighbourhoods seems to be on a 'Bubble' principle yet the impact was far wider than the immediate community who live within a proposed Liveable Neighbourhood.

Patrick Rotheram in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 10 and on the Council's website*] where he expressed his concerns about Camden Low Traffic Neighbourhood, in particular traffic calming measures such as a 20 mph limit and permanent resident parking on Paragon, enforcing the HGV weight limit, and a pedestrian crossing at the unsafe junction of Paragon and Lansdown.

Malcolm Baldwin in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 11 and on the Council's website*] said that having spoken in a general context about LTNs at last meeting, it was great to this evening have the opportunity for Cabinet to agree, and hopefully sign-off a process which could lead to

implementation of a number of major environmental and life-style improvements in the city.

Kari Ericsson in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 12 and on the Council's website*] expressed her concern about the lack of transport infrastructure, such as pooled cars, buses and taxis, in the delivery of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, and negative impact that Liveable Neighbourhoods may have on businesses in Bath.

Councillor Joanna Wright in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 13 and on the Council's website*] expressed her concerns that the Cabinet has decided not to implement the bus gate on North Road which would give an ammunition to the few who would actively oppose Liveable Neighbourhoods, and in her view this would make Liveable neighbourhoods so much harder to deliver. Councillor Joanna Wright used this opportunity to tender her resignation of the Liberal Democrat Party and said that she would be representing the ward of Lambridge as a Green Party member.

Councillor Michelle O'Doherty in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 14 and on the Council's website*] read out a statement from a resident in her constituency in respect to the parking situation around Chelsea Road.

Some members of the public were asked factual questions by the Cabinet Members in order to clarify/verify details and specifics mentioned in their statements.

## **22 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> May 2021 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **23 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET**

There were none.

## **24 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES**

There were none.

## **25 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

Councillor Richard Samuel wanted to draw Cabinet's attention to the two decisions he has made recently: the discretionary business rate scheme for 21/22 and BANES businesses in hardship by providing 100% relief to qualifying hospitality and leisure businesses for 3 months then falling to 66% for the remaining 9 months of the year,

and a land disposal at less than market value to enable the construction of a new primary school in Keynsham.

## **26 BATH CHRISTMAS MARKET**

Councillor Dine Romero introduced the report by reading out the following statement:

‘We need decide tonight whether to proceed with planning, and delivery of the Bath Christmas Market 2021.

As you will recall last year’s Christmas market was cancelled due to the rapid increase in cases without the backstop of a mass vaccination program. Uncertainty still remains due to the increases in case numbers, however this increase must be considered alongside the fact that the majority of adults are now being vaccinated, and there are low-far the cases are less severe cases and people are not ending up in our hospitals. Be assured, I am not underplaying the severity of the pandemic, and will along with the local SAGE be keeping an eye on the situation and changes will be made as required.

However, if we are to have the Christmas Market, we need to decide that now. We are already about 4 months behind where we would be in a normal year, if you can remember what that was like!

I am hopeful that all on cabinet will see that we must decide to proceed. The economic wellbeing of the city, and its traders depends on us making the right decision now.

I know some have asked to move the market to Victoria Park for example, but if we did that then the extra business for our hard pressed local traders will be lost, following such a year this could be death knell for many who are hanging on to survival by their fingertips.

The market is ranked in the top 10 of Europe, and attracts 400k visitors each year, with an estimated spend of £32.5 million in 2019. Half of which is spent elsewhere in the city, on food drink, entertainment, travel and other shopping. The market directly or indirectly supports about 500 actual jobs.

We know that greater proportion of visitors to the market are local, with perhaps 40% coming from further afield. But we are not expecting as many visitors this as that not least as we will not be marketing internationally.

As in previous years we will be asking all to travel sustainably, to use the P&Rs, or public transport wherever possible. This will also be the most sustainable market so far, we are clamping down on the use of single use plastics, relishes etc won’t be offered in plastic sachets, LED lights will be used throughout, reliance on fossil fuels on site will be replaced by mains fed electricity points.

The market itself will have an increased footprint, while the number of chalets is being reduced from 205 to 161, with spaces built into the arrangement, and the footprint of the overall market will increase. This will help manage social distancing, and help people stay safe.

The high numbers of visitors can be inconvenient for our residents, but we have a range of offers to help. These include a residents-only pre-market event, advertised quieter times for those with autism or who appreciate less bustle, and mobility helpers for those who need extra help and support getting around.

I hope all on cabinet will support this paper, and the proposal, and maybe even pop down to the market when it opens. We need this market, the city traders need this to happen, and to be honest I think we could all do with some festive cheer and normality after the last 18 months.’

Councillor Dine Romero moved the recommendations as per report.

Councillor Richard Samuel seconded the motion by saying that business community has suffered greatly during 2020 and 2021, and that the Council working with Bath BID was strongly committed to taking action to stimulate local retail and hospitality economy. The Bath Christmas market has traditionally provided a major economic boost in the run up to Christmas. This was always welcome but this year it was more important than ever to hold the event if this was possible. In reaching the decision a thought has to be given to the likely events over the next 6 months. However, the risk of cancellation must be acknowledged because of the unpredictability of the spread and mutation of the virus and the actions the government may have to take to reduce transmission. It would be impossible to predict what would happen over the next 5 to 6 months and so the decision to proceed has to be tempered both with caution and realism.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to:

1. Approve the Bath Christmas Market for 2021, from Thursday 25th November to Sunday 12th December, as set out in Appendix one (SAGE proposal).
2. Approve capital budget of £27,200 funded from revenue for the purpose of financing 2021/22 improvements to chalets.
3. Approve the creation of a smoothing capital replacement reserve to be funded from annual profits.
4. Delegate to the Director of Place Management in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People, Communities & Culture, SAGE and the Director of Public Health, key gateway decision dates on whether to:
  - (1) Scale back the plans
  - (2) Cancel the eventA decision-making framework incorporating Covid-19 related indicators, national guidance on Covid-19 restrictions and risk mitigation measures is appended at Appendix six. Decision dates will be aligned with financial milestones. This process aims to reduce both risk to public health and pressure on council budgets.

## **27 ACTIVE TRAVEL FUND SCHEMES**

Councillor Sarah Warren introduced the report by reading out the following statement:

‘The Cabinet will be considering and voting on this item with regard to amended drawings UBR 3 and 4, now updated on the council website. These corrected drawings show the ‘buffer’ area at one of the parking bays and bus stops that had been accidentally omitted.

I would like to thank everyone who submitted questions. It hasn’t been possible to answer them all before the meeting. If any are not answered either within the report, or through this evening’s discussion, they should be emailed to [ActiveTravel\\_FundConsultation@bathnes.gov.uk](mailto:ActiveTravel_FundConsultation@bathnes.gov.uk) .

On 14 Mar 2019, a climate emergency was declared here in the Guildhall. Many councillors that day, typically of extensive life experience, told how they had discussed the environmental crisis with their children and grandchildren, before deciding how to vote. Their youngsters had impressed upon them the enormity of the crisis, which looms large in young lives. And vote they did, some of you here tonight, almost unanimously, to reduce emissions to zero by 2030.

We know 29% of carbon emissions in B&NES come from land transport. Our greatest priority for reducing these is for each of us to drive less.

We also face a public health crisis: of obesity, of mental health, of air pollution affecting our lungs. These all originate in part from low levels of physical activity. The great news is that that feeling of the wind in your hair, cycling in safety, is not only great fun, but at the same time, it can help us tackle all of these problems.

Commuting by bike is a great way to build a few minutes of exercise and happiness into your life on a daily basis.

As a Council, the main way we can influence travel behaviour is through the infrastructure on our roads. We know that the biggest impediment to taking up cycling is perceived danger, and we are going to change that in Bath and North East Somerset, starting with the Upper Bristol and Beckford Roads.

Now, you might have noticed, Cabinet, that Bath is not Milton Keynes. Our roads were designed before the advent of cars and even of bikes. There are purist cyclists in this city complaining that our plans are not perfect for cyclists in every way, and at the expense of other road users.

But we know that there are still people in Bath and North East Somerset who don't cycle... (yet). We have listened to all responses as government asked us, and we hear that people have legitimate concerns. On the advice of our expert staff, and in line with best design practice, we have made changes to accommodate businesses and disabled residents, as well as other road users. In response to feedback, we have planned in improvements to pavements, spaces for loading, and additional residents' parking.

Because of our narrow, historic streets, we have compromised cycle infrastructure in some areas, but let's be clear, these cycle routes will still be safer than any current on-road cycle provision in B&NES. And we seek a continuing dialogue with Active Travel England, the new body providing national leadership on cycle infrastructure. We will monitor these schemes' success, and learn from how they work in practice, to inform similar decisions in future.

There have also been complaints that we will not be installing a bus gate on North Road, as consulted on. Well, Cabinet, whilst we are fully committed to providing safe active travel between Bath's valley floor, and the educational institutions and centres of employment on the plateau, the clue was in the name. It was a consultation, and we have listened to all our residents, as government asked us. Many told us that the planned bus gate caused them great concern. We do not intend to join the ranks of Crawley, Horsham, Kensington and Chelsea, in removing cycle lanes and wasting taxpayers' money.

We will work closely with residents and commuters in the coming months to codesign strategic routes and schemes that are the best that we can provide for all, both those who cycle, and those who don't (yet).

Now Cabinet, when you think of a cyclist, what do you imagine? A middle-aged man in Lycra on an expensive, racing bike, travelling at speed with friends on Sunday morning?

The cycle lanes that we will build are the first of many, and they are for mums in skirts with shopping bags, and children in uniform with satchels. They are for grans on e-bikes on their way to the RUH, and delivery drivers with e-cargo bikes.

Cabinet, this evening's decision is not about "cyclists" – in quotation marks – or indeed in lycra. We will build excellent infrastructure for all residents and visitors to enjoy. We will build it for our families and for our businesses. We will build it for our young people and for our older residents, for work and for play. This is what those who voted to declare a climate emergency, voted for. This is climate action. I commend this paper to you. Please back these proposals to commit the funds to progress these schemes to the next stage.'

Councillor Sarah Warren moved the recommendations as printed in the report, with an addition of the following recommendation:

*7. Delegate to the Cabinet Member for Climate and Sustainable Travel, along with the Director of Place Management to make final decisions on details for resolutions 1 to 6, and to report back to Cabinet should there be any significant departure from the recommendations.*

Councillor Manda Rigby seconded the motion by saying that everyone should be able to see the benefit in creating an environment where walking and cycling would be perceived as safe choices when making a journey, and those who really need to use their car could do so with fewer other vehicles on the road. Councillor Rigby also welcomed the fact that the schemes have been amended after receiving the consultation input from the residents. Councillor Rigby said that credit must be given to Councillors Warren and McCabe, and the officers for working so hard to find a deliverable set of proposals which, whilst not giving any one section of the community 100% of what it initially wanted, has brought people together to understand the benefits of the current proposal. Councillor Rigby added that she would be looking forward to the setting up of a citizens jury, or similar, to examine the issues round travel to the University of Bath as a whole, and that such a working arrangement can show that it was possible to be both ambitious in aims, and considerate in implementation. Councillor Rigby finished her statement by saying that from her personal perspective, it could be possible to be a supporter of active travel whilst still not supporting non-working elements of the schemes originally presented.

Councillor Richard Samuel welcomed the report by saying that in a city such as Bath creating these safe routes was very challenging due to the historic layout of the city. Many roads were narrow and congested, and in some areas car ownership was very high with little road space available due to parking. Road widths were often narrow reflecting historic patterns of land values that reduced the size of these spaces. In setting out the schemes before the Cabinet today there has been an enormous amount of work and discussion to reach the proposals on the table. It has to be acknowledged that not all the original proposals were popular with the residents directly affected, but what was now before the Cabinet offers the best mix of achievability and value for money.

Councillor Alison Born also welcomed the report by saying that she was happy to support the current plans going out to consultation and she would be looking forward to further pedestrian and cycle friendly measures being introduced across the city in the coming months and years. It was imperative for the Council to consider the feedback from the consultation as these modified schemes would support and encourage active travel (both walking and cycling) which would help to improve the health and wellbeing of our citizens by enabling them to move around the city more



safely, and also take into account the everyday needs of the residents and businesses that were directly affected by the introduction of the cycle lanes.

Councillor Tom Davies welcomed the report by saying that the Active Travel Schemes would seek to rebalance the way in which we travel around our area and tackle the great challenges of pollution, the climate emergency and improving our health and wellbeing. Councillor Davies added that this would enable families, neighbours and residents who enjoy cycling to start take to the streets and roads with confidence helped further by the huge growth in e-bikes and scooters. Councillor Davies thanked everyone who responded to the consultation and he was delighted that the Council was able to invest additional funds in this cycling infrastructure, in addition to anything provided by WECA and central government.

The rest of the Cabinet also welcomed the report, thanked to all those who have provided their feedback in the consultation, and acknowledged the work of the relevant Cabinet Members, Cabinet Assistants and officers on this matter.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to:

- 1 Approve proceeding to the Traffic Regulation Order stage of consultation for the amended Upper Bristol Road scheme (as outlined within the report);
- 2 Approve proceeding to the Traffic Regulation Order stage of consultation for the Beckford Road cycle lane scheme;
- 3 Agree that, should the Upper Bristol Road and Beckford Road schemes go ahead following the Traffic Regulation Order stage, a review of both schemes should be undertaken once they have been in place for 12 months;
- 4 Agree that officers explore external funding streams to cover the £140,438 difference between the Active Travel Fund allocation and the cost of the Upper Bristol Road and Beckford Road proposals. If such funding cannot be secured, delegated approval will be sought to use the £150,000 funding already allocated in the 2021/22 Transport Improvement Fund for the development of walking and cycling schemes;
- 5 Agree that officers should commission a citizens' jury or other suitable process of deep public engagement, to determine the most appropriate safe, strategic cycle route to improve between the city centre, the University of Bath and the large employment and education sites in the Claverton Down area, which will take place before the end of this financial year;
- 6 Approve proceeding to the Traffic Regulation Order stage of the Combe Down to University of Bath scheme as part of the wider business case development work being undertaken to improve walking and cycling routes between Combe Down, the city centre and the University of Bath.
7. Delegate to the Cabinet Member for Climate and Sustainable Travel, along with the Director of Place Management to make final decisions on details for resolutions 1 to 6, and to report back to Cabinet should there be any significant departure from the recommendations.

## **28 LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS**

Councillor Sarah Warren introduced the report by reading out the following statement:

'Liveable Neighbourhoods are residential areas where road space is reconsidered. They create pleasant outdoor environments in which people can relax and socialise

and enjoy spending time. They are safe, welcoming spaces for outdoor activity, where neighbours are able to make more connections with one another, and they make for vibrant local high streets where people want to spend time and money. To create these schemes, a range of measures, which may include vehicle restrictions, traffic calming, residents' parking zones, additional planting, and electric vehicle charging, are used to reduce the dominance of motor vehicles in residential areas, although people are still able to access their homes by car. By making it safer to move around actively, such measures enable more journeys to take place on foot and have been demonstrated over time to reduce the number of journeys taken by car. This may even reduce congestion on the roads for those with no alternative but to travel by car.

They will not disadvantage, and should actively assist disabled people, by incorporating wider pavements and disabled parking spaces where needed, and by enabling more people who can, to leave their cars at home.

The schemes are an important part of the council's wider programme of works aiming to reduce carbon emissions, improve air quality, enhance road safety, and promote healthy lifestyles by encouraging the use of sustainable transport. They will breathe new life into residential areas and improve the quality of the public realm.

The programme builds upon our pioneering project bringing in the first charging Clean Air Zone outside London earlier this year.

Some have expressed concern about traffic displacement, and about air quality impacts outside the schemes. Whilst displacement can be an issue in the initial few days, over the weeks that follow installation, a new pattern of traffic flow develops, as people find new routines – and fewer of these new routines will involve a car.

However, we do recognise people's real worries, so as for the Clean Air Zone, we will commit to monitoring locations of concern, so that we can determine the facts, and take action if necessary.

Cabinet adopted our Liveable Neighbourhoods policy on 10th December 2020 following a consultation on the principles, which received over 1,500 responses, demonstrating overwhelming support for the concept.

47 schemes were submitted, and tonight, Cabinet, I am bringing forward to you the first 15 that we are proposing to take forward for detailed community consultation and design, the next stages in the process. 12 of these are in Bath, and 3 in North East Somerset, reflecting the fact that many more Bath councillors made submissions.

This is absolutely not a policy, however, that can only work in cities, and I would strongly encourage all North East Somerset councillors to reconsider, ahead of the next deadline on 5th August, whether their residents might also benefit, along with people in Bath, from a pleasanter public realm, and calmer residential areas. I am sure that every ward has a spot with too much through traffic, and I would encourage all councillors to engage their communities in identifying these.

Prioritisation of submissions was carried out using a scoring matrix including factors such as: number of affected households, severity of issues, level of through traffic, community deprivation index, and impact on routes to school – but also factors to do with the logistics of implementation. So, in the first instance, we aim to complete relatively simple schemes, saving complex ones for when we have gained organisational learning from earlier projects.

For the first phase of schemes, residents, businesses and local organisations will be consulted and given the opportunity to work with councillors, with preliminary designs prepared, starting in the autumn. There will then be further public consultation, before detailed designs are drawn up and the first schemes implemented.

All schemes judged to be deliverable will be delivered in due course, and work to design Phase 2 schemes will follow on from Phase 1. Indeed, as we consult and

listen to residents, it is possible that some schemes in Phase 1 may fall by the wayside, and projects in Phase 2 may be brought forward more rapidly. Several schemes will be installed by 2023, and designs completed on others so that they can progress rapidly when funds and capacity permit.

Cabinet, Liveable Neighbourhoods were a manifesto commitment, forming a key pillar of our administration's plans to improve public health, and enable sustainable transport choices. They will create connected, healthy, vibrant communities where motor vehicles are less dominant, improving the local environment for residents, and fostering conditions where people are enabled to use alternatives to the private car. I commend this report to you and ask you to approve provisional allocation of £2.2m funding for the development and delivery of the first 15 schemes, over the next two financial years.'

Councillor Sarah Warren moved the recommendations.

Councillor David Wood seconded the motion by saying that he was delighted to support this report which would be applicable not just to Bath but also to rural areas of North East Somerset. This report was about giving power back to our residents who have helped the Council in identifying what the problems were in their communities.

Councillor Dine Romero welcomed the report and added that she would want to see more about arrangements regarding traffic that may be displaced.

Councillor Alison Born welcomed the report by saying that these schemes were the start of the move to reduce dominance of cars in our streets, and to support the development of communities where people should feel that children can travel to school safely independently, and where people can interact without the ever present threat and fast moving through traffic.

Councillor Manda Rigby also supported the report by saying that the schemes going forward were on the agenda because of requests from the community, and the same community would be involved and consulted on further schemes. Councillor Rigby added that the administration was committed to raising the quality of where all of our communities live, and this was just a starting point.

Councillor Tom Davies also welcomed the report by saying that, designed well with engagement with local residents, Liveable Neighbourhoods have the ability to transform our communities - making our neighbourhoods safer, healthier and ultimately happier places for all. Councillor Davies thanked to all involved in the production of this proposal and said that he would be looking forward to the next few months to see the transformative impact of these new Liveable Neighbourhoods on our communities.

Councillor Tim Ball also welcomed the report and added that by implementing these schemes the Council should make sure that there was nobody adversely affected by these schemes.

Councillor Richard Samuel also welcomed the report by saying that this was the beginning of the rebalancing of local priorities away from the dominance of vehicles in streets across B&NES and towards less intrusive environments for residents. The response from local communities and their ward councillors has been tremendous and this report now moves that to the next level. Councillor Samuel announced that

in preparing the 22/23 budget he would intend to commit further capital funds to this programme to enable it to extend further in 22/23 and beyond into 23/24. The precise amounts would not be announced today but would be determined once the impact of the schemes being announced today has been assessed.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to:

1. Approve the priority list of phase 1 liveable neighbourhood areas to be progressed as outlined in section 3.11 to 3.12 of this report.
2. Note schemes will be considered in consultation with other workstreams.
3. Approve expenditure of £1m from £2.2m allocation (£1,700k in 2021/22 and £500k in 2022/23) for liveable neighbourhoods within the Transportation Delivery Programme Provisional Approval. This will provide funding to support project activity outlined in 3.14 up to detailed design in 2021/22 and provide some funding to deliver priority schemes that are aligned with other portfolio priorities and capable of early implementation.
4. Full approval of balance of funding for programme delivery to be delegated for approval by the Director of Place Management in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Climate and Sustainable Travel and the Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Resources as schemes become ready for implementation.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Date Confirmed and Signed \_\_\_\_\_

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

## **CABINET MEETING 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2021**

### **STATEMENTS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

1. Fia Heijltjes (6 years old and accompanied by parent) – Safe Cycling Infrastructure
2. David Redgewell – Planning and transport issues
3. Susan Charles – City Centre Security
4. Shiva Page – Accessibility and Equality issues
5. Martin Grixoni – Recycling and Financial Priorities
6. Alison Herbert – Bath Christmas Market
7. Kathryn Davis – Bath Christmas Market
8. Charlie Williams - Provision for Active Transport in Bath
9. Jeremy Labram – Liveable Neighbourhoods
10. Rachael Hushon – Liveable Neighbourhoods
11. Lynda Lloyd – Liveable Neighbourhoods
12. Patrick Rotheram – Liveable Neighbourhoods
13. Malcolm Baldwin – Low Traffic Neighbourhoods
14. Kari Ericsson – Low Traffic Neighbourhoods

#### **Councillors –**

1. Joanna Wright – Active Travel and Liveable Neighbourhoods
2. Michelle O'Doherty – Chelsea Road Parking

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS**

<b>M</b>	<b>01</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Vic Pritchard
Six weeks is typically the minimum period allowed for public consultation. The Council, however, engages in as little as four weeks. When simple changes needed on a bylaw require twelve weeks consultation, why has the Council reduced the period of public consultation so severely?			
<b>Answer from:</b>			Councillor Kevin Guy
<i>Cabinet has not made a decision to reduce consultation periods.</i>			
<b>M</b>	<b>02</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Vic Pritchard
Please provide a breakdown of the Council's recycling rates over the past five years, including current rates.			
<b>Answer from:</b>			Councillor David Wood
<p><i>The reuse, recycling and composting rates for the last 5 years are as follows:</i></p> <p><i>2016/17 – 54.1%</i></p> <p><i>2017/18 – 54.8%</i></p> <p><i>2018/19 – 58.7%</i></p> <p><i>2019/20 – 56.2%</i></p> <p><i>2020/21 – 60% (subject to verification from DEFRA).</i></p>			

M	03	Question from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard
How many fines has the Council issued, and how many successful prosecutions has the Council had, for fly-tipping over the past 12 months?			
Answer from:		Councillor David Wood	
<i>In the last 12 months we have issued 36 Fixed Penalty Notices for Fly Tipping.</i> <i>There have been no prosecutions for fly tipping in the last 12 months, mainly due to the impact of Covid restrictions on the work of the Enforcement Team. As restrictions are now lifting, investigations are being taken forward.</i>			
M	04	Question from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard
How much waste, from both kerbside and from the HWRC, has gone to landfill and how much has been incinerated between 2017 and 2021?			
Answer from:		Councillor David Wood	
<i>The figures below are from the kerbside, HWRC and trade waste and are both tonnages directly delivered and as an output of Mechanical Biological Treatment.</i>			
		<i>Landfill (tonnes)</i>	<i>Energy from Waste (tonnes)</i>
<i>2017/18</i>		<i>10,842</i>	<i>22,208</i>
<i>2018/19</i>		<i>10,353</i>	<i>20,301</i>

2019/20	9,892	21,978
2020/21	2,400	26,134

**M 05**      **Question from:**      Councillor Vic Pritchard

Please provide the tonnages of recycling waste collected from the kerbside between 2017 and 2021 for the following items: glass, cardboard, paper, plastic and food waste.

**Answer from:**      Councillor David Wood

<i>Material</i>	<i>17/18</i>	<i>18/19</i>	<i>19/20</i>	<i>20/21</i>
<i>Non-recyclable (black bag) waste collected at the kerbside (tonnes)</i>	23,312	19,226	19,858	21,990
<i>Glass (tonnes)</i>	5,275	5,340	5,451	6,998
<i>Card (tonnes)</i>	3,091	2,999	3,518	5,154
<i>Paper (tonnes)</i>	3,640	3,412	3,174	2,678
<i>Plastic (tonnes)</i>	1,703	1,887	1,922	2,359
<i>Food Waste (tonnes)</i>	5,461	6,648	6,959	8,031



M	06	Question from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard																																				
Please provide the tonnages of non-recyclable (black bag) waste collected from the kerbside between 2017 and 2021.																																							
Answer from:			Councillor David Wood																																				
<table><tr><td>Material</td><td>17/18</td><td>18/19</td><td>19/20</td><td>20/21</td></tr><tr><td>Non-recyclable (black bag) waste collected at the kerbside (tonnes)</td><td>23,312</td><td>19,226</td><td>19,858</td><td>21,990</td></tr><tr><td>Glass (tonnes)</td><td>5,275</td><td>5,340</td><td>5,451</td><td>6,998</td></tr><tr><td>Card (tonnes)</td><td>3,091</td><td>2,999</td><td>3,518</td><td>5,154</td></tr><tr><td>Paper (tonnes)</td><td>3,640</td><td>3,412</td><td>3,174</td><td>2,678</td></tr><tr><td>Plastic (tonnes)</td><td>1,703</td><td>1,887</td><td>1,922</td><td>2,359</td></tr><tr><td>Food Waste (tonnes)</td><td>5,461</td><td>6,648</td><td>6,959</td><td>8,031</td></tr></table>					Material	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	Non-recyclable (black bag) waste collected at the kerbside (tonnes)	23,312	19,226	19,858	21,990	Glass (tonnes)	5,275	5,340	5,451	6,998	Card (tonnes)	3,091	2,999	3,518	5,154	Paper (tonnes)	3,640	3,412	3,174	2,678	Plastic (tonnes)	1,703	1,887	1,922	2,359	Food Waste (tonnes)	5,461	6,648	6,959	8,031
Material	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21																																			
Non-recyclable (black bag) waste collected at the kerbside (tonnes)	23,312	19,226	19,858	21,990																																			
Glass (tonnes)	5,275	5,340	5,451	6,998																																			
Card (tonnes)	3,091	2,999	3,518	5,154																																			
Paper (tonnes)	3,640	3,412	3,174	2,678																																			
Plastic (tonnes)	1,703	1,887	1,922	2,359																																			
Food Waste (tonnes)	5,461	6,648	6,959	8,031																																			
M	07	Question from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard																																				
In a press release of 9 June 2021, the reason the Council has given for the delay in closing Cleveland Bridge for essential repairs is that “it has taken a little longer to arrange the diversion route”. Please explain why the diversion route wasn’t confirmed before last week.																																							

<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Manda Rigby
<p><i>The Council had worked continually with neighbouring Authorities since 2019 to agree suitable diversion routes. This included using the A350 through Wiltshire. However, in April 2021 Wiltshire Council communicated that they would not now give consent for the A350 to be used as a diversion route due to detrimental impact on their highway network. For such permission not to be forthcoming this late in the day for a major project known so long in advance by a neighbouring authority is unusual. This resulted in the Council having to review the diversion route options with South Gloucestershire Council and Highways England to agree alternatives.</i></p>		
<b>M</b>	<b>08</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Grant Johnson
<p>Recently, Somerset West and Taunton Council published plans to paint a 62m long stretch of footpath in the Pride and Progress Colours, which include brown and black to reflect ethnic diversity. The painted path will last 15 years without the need for maintenance like coloured zebra crossings.</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member agree that this is a positive way for the Council to show that it is inclusive and welcoming to all groups that have felt marginalised in the past and join me in the wishing all B&amp;NES residents a happy pride month?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor David Wood
<p><i>This sounds like a positive way to celebrate diversity and we will look into the idea.</i></p>		
<b>M</b>	<b>09</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Grant Johnson
<p>Following on from the announcement some time ago that plans to build 3 fossil fuel burning gas generators in Midsomer Norton were put on hold by the developer, do we have any insight to what their plans are now and can you give residents any guarantee that this project won't go ahead?</p>		

<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Sarah Warren
<i>The Council is involved in a positive dialogue with Conrad Energy, who are open to modifying their business plan for the Midsomer Norton site away from gas generators. This constructive dialogue has not yet concluded.</i>		
<b>M</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Grant Johnson
<p>Since the start of the year I have received 9 separate notifications of waste and recycling collection problems for my ward of Paulton. These were as follows:</p> <p>14th June - Garden Waste</p> <p>7th June - Kerbside Recycling</p> <p>31st May - Kerbside Recycling</p> <p>24th May - Kerbside Recycling</p> <p>20th April - Kerbside Recycling</p> <p>12th April - Kerbside Recycling</p> <p>8th March - Kerbside Recycling</p> <p>1st March - Kerbside Recycling</p> <p>25th January - Kerbside Recycling</p> <p>There has been 24 weeks of collections since the start of the year with 9 of those having problems raised in my ward, representing a 37.5% chance that residents in Paulton are likely to have a collection issue with their waste and recycling. Do you agree that:</p> <p>a) that residents are rightfully angry at this disgraceful level of service?</p>		

- b) the rate of failure in my ward is at an unacceptably high level?
- c) residents are paying, through Council Tax, for a service that clearly isn't being delivered?

I would like to know what is going to be done by this Council to rectify this situation?

**Answer from:**

Councillor David Wood

*The vast majority of our residents are hugely appreciative of the work that our waste and recycling crews have continued to do throughout the pandemic - carrying out 135,000 refuse and recycling collections every week throughout the district, collecting significantly increased tonnages of waste throughout the lockdown periods, which shows no sign of letting up now that many people continue to work from home. I express my personal thanks for those staff who have been working above and beyond to ensure that the vast majority of collections are being completed on time and to high standards.*

*We are sorry that some residents of Paulton have experienced delays in their collections, the properties impacted by these notifications was 1.2% of the total number of refuse and recycling collections that would have taken place in Paulton during those 24 weeks.*

*There is now a national shortage of LGV drivers, a problem being experience by local authorities and waste collection companies throughout the country and we are not alone in the region in suffering from a shortage of staff. We are working to address the skills deficit by creating even more training opportunities for drivers now that driving schools are back open for business.*

*Our waste collection services remain amongst the highest achieving in the country with top quartile performance, recycling 60% of waste this year and we thank our residents for their support in helping with this achievement, and for the support that they show to our hard working crews.*

**M**

**11**

**Question from:**

Councillor Grant Johnson

I have recently been contacted by a local resident who is horrified at the shortage of 'M4(3) Category 3: Wheelchair User

Dwellings' in our council authority.

Can you please inform me of the following:

- a) are we aware of how many Cat 3 dwellings there are available across social housing providers in B&NES?
- b) is there a register of those individuals with specific needs who might require a Cat 3 dwelling?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Tom Davies

***a) are we aware of how many Cat 3 dwellings there are available across social housing providers in B&NES?***

*We do not hold that information.*

***b) is there a register of those individuals with specific needs who might require a Cat 3 dwelling?***

*There is no cross-tenure list of individuals held by the Council.*

*However, the Homesearch scheme, the Council's housing allocation scheme, does identify individuals requiring wheelchair accessible housing. All wheelchair accessible properties are prioritised to wheelchair users when any property is advertised through Homesearch. In addition if the property is new build, and therefore more time is available, the Occupational Therapy team will be engaged at an early stage to ensure suitable clients can be considered, and if necessary further and bespoke adaptations can be considered if required.*

**M**

**12**

**Question from:**

Councillor Grant Johnson

Is the Cabinet aware of the CPRE's guide to 'Quiet Lanes' and will they be actively looking in to this as a strategy to run

alongside their 'Liveable Neighbourhoods' schemes so that rural communities benefit from the funding available, just as much as our urban areas do?			
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Sarah Warren	
<i>I am aware of this excellent publication from the CPRE and actively support proposals for quiet lanes, which are founded on similar principles to liveable neighbourhoods. Members representing rural communities are welcome to submit bids for quiet lanes, road closures or modal filters under the liveable neighbourhoods' programme. To date, we have received a small number of applications from Members representing rural communities, including Charlcombe, Publow &amp; Whitchurch and Queen Charlton. The next deadline for applications is 5th August 2021.</i>			
<b>M</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Grant Johnson
Will the cabinet member agree with me that encouraging residents to take up walking and cycling as an alternative to driving will be a positive step to fighting the climate emergency? Will they therefore acknowledge my recent campaigning to get further funding for cycling connections between rural communities and key national cycle networks and make commitments to improving the infrastructure in all areas of Bath and North East Somerset?			
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Sarah Warren	
<i>I whole-heartly agree that encouraging residents to take up walking and cycling as an alternative to driving will play a major role in tackling the climate emergency and would like to join you in urging Somer Valley residents to take this step, which will not only benefit the environment, but their own health as well. In the 2021/22 transport capital programme we have allocated funds to commission a cycling and walking masterplan for inter-urban routes and will be undertaking feasibility work on a new off-road cycle route between Charlton Road and Silver Street, Midsomer Norton. We are also working closely with WECA, which has commissioned a bus, walking, cycling and wheeling study for the A37 and A367 corridors. This study will include investigation of a new walking and cycle route along the former Midsomer Norton to Bristol railway corridor, links to adjoining communities, such as Paulton and improvements to national cycle route 24 between Radstock and Bath. A strategic outline business case for</i>			

*improvements on both corridors is due in November 2021 and WECA has indicated considerable funding to support identified schemes. This work will deliver high quality cycle routes which will create step change in the attractiveness of cycling for residents in our rural communities.*

**M 14**

**Question from:**

Councillor Vic Pritchard

How long does the Council intend to continue to require members of the public to book time slots to visit the Household Waste Recycling Centres?

**Answer from:**

Councillor David Wood

*A public consultation into the booking system was carried out in February this year and the system proved overwhelmingly popular. A report is being prepared for the Cabinet Member by officers with recommendations on the future of the booking system based on the public consultation feedback. This report is due in July.*

This page is intentionally left blank



Fia Heijltjes statement to Cabinet on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2021

Hello, my name is Fia and I am 6 years old.

I like to cycle to school but I also want to cycle to swimming.

My mum and dad think that the roads are not safe. The cars come too close and go too fast.

My little sister also wants to cycle to school when she is older.

Cars are not good for the environment. They make the air yucky. If the roads are safer, more people will cycle and walk.

I want you to listen to young people because we want to protect our planet.

Thank you for listening.

This page is intentionally left blank

Susan Charles statement to Cabinet on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2021

' THE RING OF STEEL ' .. ...

is already having the same effect as the governments

' CIRCLE OF PROTECTION ' .....

has had on our care homes during this pandemic.

Bluebadge holders, those with ability issues are already being kept out of the city centre depriving them of essential shopping and businesses, affecting their mobility and eventually, as has happened in care homes, deaths and their MENTAL HEALTH.

Taxis during the day cannot access the city centre to collect passengers, hence the passengers are TRAPPED.

The Disability Discrimination Act 1999 + Equalities Act 2010 states :

' Anyone providing a service to the public - from the corner shop to Government agencies - will NOT be able to treat disabled customers less favourably than anyone else,

and service providers WILL HAVE A DUTY to make reasonable adjustments to make their services accessible to everyone.

THIS UNCLUDES::

Changing practises policies and procedures which have the effect of discriminating against disabled people.

AND

Providing services by reasonable alternative means if the service is inaccessible to disabled people.

To obtain a Bluebadge your GP has to confirm that there is difficulty in walking 50mts

The tourist that this city depends on, many elderly and disabled like our locals cannot park with a Bluebadge within 50mtrs of our main tourist attractions .

Please.... take this back to the drawing board and rethink not only for the Tourist trade but for our local communities who support this City all year round.

Susan Charles.

Access Bames Chair.

I know these issues have been brought up before but I am still unclear about what actions are being implemented to mitigate against issues raised in the Independent Accessibility Reports, the EqlA's or raised by previous speakers.

- Westgate St where opticians chemists and other essential services are is not accessible to BBH. Alfresco dining is creating new barriers at a time when ppl who have shielded for over a year may want to access the centre. BBH parking is still either not available or further away then the prescribed distance.( walk less than 50m unaided.)
- Schemes that rely on charging burden the poorest. We have several areas in the top 20% most deprived in UK. What AT provision is funded for them?
- Consultations are biased, reports into schemes are overly complicated and not easily accessible to sensory deprived, learning difficulties or those without online access. Transparency is not having to read through 20 or more reports, graphs and maps. This info should be made simpler and proactively sent out in alternative formats so all residents are fully informed.
- Cycling and walking should be encouraged but not at expense of those who can't cycle or walk. Especially when we have plenty of existing cycling infrastructure. Why is UBR even needed when tow path regeneration is imminent? Congestion on UBR would cause huge issues for hospital access.
- Concerns sent are mostly answered with cutting & pasting parts of the reportd I am raising issues around which isn't addressing concerns. Being told by Accessibility staff at the council that I need to put in a FOI request for basic information is not accountability. Elected representatives blocking people if they ask uncomfortable questions is not transparent or democratic.
- Listening is just the beginning. Adapting schemes to actively address the concerns is also necessary. Listening and then not acting on what is being said is meaningless.
- Debate has become toxic because the idea that cycling is the solution and all driving is bad hasn't been challenged. Shops need deliveries, tradespeople need vans. For some disabled ppl their car is their independence.
- Many other ways of tackling climate change are being sidelined in favour of emphasising cycling for able bodied people who WFH or who can easily afford EV or e-bikes.
- What % of AT funding has been or will be spent on adapted access to cycling? Why only 2 groups out of 15 or more at the ATAF advocating for access and equality? Which type of cyclists are being prioritised, sports or leisure, families or

individuals?? Diff cycling need have to be honestly addressed. NR was never accessible to casual cyclists.

- It has been widely reported the issues that existing LTN's have created for those living outside, schools & homes on red routes, disability access and emergency vehicle delays. Are these very serious issues being considered before implementing them here? How do we become individual advocates in the process so all needs are included in solutions.
- Displaced traffic post CAZ is already a problem from Penny Quick all the way to Claverton. IF this isn't being monitored how can it be modified if necessary or its effectiveness measured. Will monitoring on perimeter of LTN's be in place?
- LTN's with red routes within them will exacerbate congestion. Public transport options stuck in traffic will not help people to not use their cars. If car use isn't reduced before closing roads then more congestion will inevitably be caused.
- Will LTN's rely on PCN's also? How many PCNs were issued to BBH?
- BB drop off spaces in bike lanes or crossing bike lanes to board bus are dangerous. BBH don't always have someone to 'drop them off'. Disabled people presently feel excluded in these schemes. Not all disability provision is about mobility. Neuro-divergance is a disability. Mental Illness is a disability. Poverty also creates barriers to access.
- Implementing these schemes in a global pandemic when public transport is at less capacity seems foolhardy at best and dangerous at worst. Especially as the Delta variant has trebled in Bath in as many weeks.
- I will continue to ask questions to advocate for myself and for those I love and work with, who live with poverty, invisible and visible disabilities or have any other barriers. I would like my wealth of knowledge, experience as well as my inclusive working practices and innovative ideas to be respected, heard and welcomed instead of ignored, dismissed or treated as troublesome. I want a meeting with full representation from local groups working directly with disability, mental health, poverty and social exclusion to meet with council and discuss in detail all the plans so that we can advocate for all needs being met in reality. This needs to happen soon if you are serious about implementing equality and accessibility measures. Group think is not the way forward. Listening to concerns means that schemes can be made workable for all. I hope that us who have concerns can be invited to the table so that we can all move forward with sensible, reasonable debate to make improvements to the city so many of love.

## **To BANES Cabinet 23 Jun 2021**

The general theme I am concerned about here is misplaced priorities.

Today I am concentrating on my concerns with recycling and refuse collection, but I come at it with this administration's history of poor and untimely decision making with foreseeable U-turns.

I remind you of the debacle of the 5G masts and us being ridiculed in the national press, with tinfoil hats being on general issue.

The Cleveland Bridge fiasco, which so could have been worked on over the last year when traffic was low, but now with yet another delay due to one person being tested for Covid – if the Scottish Football team can manage it, surely there could have been a way.

This is not to mention the sideways and most recent saga of a lack of planning in respect of the required diversion. To be scrabbling around with nothing in place at this stage just beggars belief. There has been ample time to get it sorted, or indeed discuss and agree with National Government if there was local opposition, as it is a major trunk road.

(I suspect our LibDem MP and LibDem Council do not relish having to deal with a Tory Government, but that is seemingly what they are failing to do in any way effectively.)

I could divert to the sorry saga of the frisbee golf, or the rather sad saga of Tufa field, but thankfully these have also both been u-turned on. The LTNs are being spoken about by others, and all I might add here is that if you're going to close a road to traffic without consultation to encourage cycling, probably the last one in the city you would choose is North Road – the next one I am led to believe could well be Weston Lane .... It really does make you more than wonder.

I am nonetheless grateful to Cllr Guy who has imported from his time as a Labour Cllr in Telford at least some common sense from the recent past but am still concerned about his own agenda going forward, whether that be from his shifting political allegiances, or perhaps a desire to stand as an MP at the next General election.

In any case and with that background – to our rubbish and recycling...

We were the last City and Unitary Authority in the Country to open up a tip, with the resultant increase in fly tipping.

The ridiculous suggestion of a tip tax to get rid of Household DIY waste, with incorrectly sourced statistics to back up the decision, thankfully now itself binned.

The lack of alternatives or meaningful consultation to closing Midland Road.



It now is fairly easy to get in there on the booking system, but I am yet to be convinced by it. On a number of occasions, I have been the only car in there – previously there was often a queue, no matter what the time. I do ask myself where the missing carloads are going.

The lack of penalising those increased fly-tippers (only 36, or is it none, in the last 12 months) – seemingly down to Covid restrictions on anyone going out to gather evidence. – really!

The increase in failure to execute roadside collection at all – citing lack of drivers. I note you have only just started advertising for these, and no neighbouring authorities are, which either means they don't have such a problem, or they've got their act together better. I also note that you offer less-good terms which is likely to be a major factor.

You are trumpeting sending a greater proportion to 'burning for energy', a 27.8% increase in fact – this is not something to gloat about.

On the last figures available we have dropped from 18<sup>th</sup> in the country under the last administration, to 34<sup>th</sup>. With now more fly-tipping and a greater proportion of our recycled mats sent for burning, I cannot imagine we'll be back up there.

So, in summary, I'd ask this administration to

- live up to its's much trumpeted green agenda
- better control and prosecute the increased fly tippers
- Give us some viable alternatives to the Midland Road to consult on and agree in good order
- Swiftly publish the full facts of the recent consultation on recycling booking
- Be less inept

**BATH CHRISTMAS MARKET – ALLISON HERBERT CEO OF BATH BID  
STATEMENT TO B&NES CABINET 23 JUNE 2021**

Bath Christmas market is a longstanding and significant feature on Bath's calendar. It attracts large numbers of visitors, particularly at weekends.

This year, when businesses have taken out huge loans just to survive and although it has changed hands with the closure of Visit Bath, we have never needed it more and it is a brand of rare quality, which the city cannot afford to lose.

I have a few stats from mobile phone use in 2018 and 2019 which show that the month of December is when we welcome most visitors to the city from beyond a 15 mile radius.

In December 2019, we saw a 60/40 split between local visitors and people coming from further away whereas in October it was 70/30 showing how the balance shifts. At the same time, the footfall in December is about twice November's.

Which means that Christmas is the shop window opportunity for the city. People come to the market which is professionally and widely promoted and then come back later in the year.

Why do we have a Christmas market and who benefits?

Aside from the stallholders, hosting the market in the heart of the city means that there are multiple beneficiaries evidenced by the Visa spending information.

In the last quarter of 2019, people spent almost four times as much on food and drink as during the rest of the year, 3 times more on leisure and attractions (the Roman Baths), about twice as much in shops and restaurants. Hotels saw a 33% increase over the winter period. The benefits are felt across all sectors and it doesn't take a mathematician to understand that the impact of a four-fold increase will be felt throughout the rest of year. Many businesses have shared with me how they are only able to continue to trade because of the November and December boost that their businesses enjoy thanks to the Christmas market.

So, what is the problem with the Christmas market?

If you look at the issues which people complain about, it's mainly access, parking and transport.

The Bath BID is keen to help with these issues and will work with partners to get the practical details right and make this year's market a wonderful experience for residents as well as visitors for us all to be proud of.

It is our job together to make sure that Bath maintains its competitive edge, maximising the local and specialist companies represented in the market and showcasing the city. Clearly having a Xmas market is beneficial to the local economy – so considering the data, this year could be the moment to consider having a smaller market and keeping it for longer, perhaps a full month and spreading the stalls more evenly across the entire city.

With those modifications the city could hold on to the positive aspects of the brand, reduce the burden on transport (400,000 visitors into 18 days) and deliver a more customer friendly experience, allowing visitors and locals to coexist.

The Christmas message is all about sharing, at that moment of the year, the business community appreciates the willingness of all of us to share the city with our guests.

This year is an opportunity not to be missed, for change, rebrand, making it a far better experience, with a clear marketing message to enjoy Bath at Christmas.

Despite Camden itself missing out on phase 1 of the Liveable Neighbourhoods Programme we are highly supportive of the strategy. Unfortunately it is often characterised as a local traffic displacement exercise, rather than as a much bigger lever to pull for 'modal shift', away from fossil fuelled transport, to minimise the environmental and climate threats we all face. Therefore LN phase 1 must succeed for the sake of all of us in the longer term, and we offer our wholehearted support and help if required.

For Camden this is a rather long story of hard work, dashed hopes and frustration:

- starting with our well-researched and constructive report written in 2017 leading to the offer of a bus gate but probably falling at the wrong point of the election cycle,
- the choice of CAZ, Class C, which has achieved little or nothing for neighbourhood streets such as those in NE Bath,
- and now unfortunately not being included in LN phase 1.

Ever since LTNs appeared in the current administration's election manifesto in early 2019 we have considered carefully and consulted, where we were able, on how a Low Traffic Neighbourhood might be applied to the whole of the NE Bath cut-through which extends through Lower Lansdown, Camden, Fairfield Park, and Larkhall. This looked as though it would need the imposition of some sort of modal filter to allow local buses and active travellers through but not motor vehicles, which might be controversial to some at first glance, or in the words of the report you are considering this evening, "to be too complex and to pose too many challenges to be included in the phase 1 programme as a complete project".

What might not be understood by everyone is that as a community, living close to such a filter, those in Camden were quite prepared to lead this work and accept the continual inconvenience of being subject to the same restrictions it would impose on others. We also recognised that any schemes would be subject to the safeguards included in Experimental Traffic Orders and therefore might not endure. Now, the very longstanding need to make our neighbourhoods safer and healthier for residents and active travellers into the city, to the local schools and nurseries, and to other much used amenities.

We are extremely keen to get into in the Liveable Neighbourhood programme as soon as possible, and so, for our own education, can we please see the detail of the assessment of the Walcot bid to understand what the project team's misgivings were over complexity and challenge so that we, and our colleagues, can start to address those now.

Finally, may we offer Godspeed for those areas, fortunate enough to be included in phase 1, and for an early start to phase 2.

Jeremy

Jeremy Labram, Chair, Camden Residents' Association

I would like to say thank you. Residents who live in the lower Lansdown area are very grateful to the Highways Officers who have recognised that the Kingsmead area and lower Lansdown need to be looked at in a joined up way with regards to Liveable neighbourhood planning. Clearly the Officers have taken the trouble to understand and address possible displacement and mitigate for it to deliver the best possible outcomes for the 2 areas.

We are grateful to be considered for traffic improvements to help calm speeding traffic, reduce rat running volumes through the residential roads, tackle the width and weight restriction violations we are experiencing daily and to make walking on our streets safer and healthier for school children and residents of all ages.

Some time ago a group of keen walkers, Walk. Lansdown started a petition to campaign for safer streets across the Lansdown Ward, we now have over 600 signatures supporting traffic calming to help make our narrow sometimes treacherous streets safer to use as pedestrians. To make all roads in Lansdown 20mph and for this to be enforceable.

Some of us have also formed a Community Speedwatch Group to take affirmative action and help get the message out there to those motorists who simply don't care about pedestrian safety and race through our streets ignoring the safe 20mph speed limit. 20 really should be plenty across all the residential streets of Bath.

Whilst doing our shifts we observe a lot of needless local school run traffic, sometimes children who we know living within 400m of their school are being driven door to door. We also notice how difficult it is for those parents who are trying to walk with their children to school to navigate very busy streets, both residential and main roads.

We see how tricky it is to cross the junction at the Marlborough Tavern for children walking to school, how difficult it is for the lollipop man at St Andrews, how treacherous the junction at St Stephens Church is and how difficult it is to cross into the High Common on Cavendish Road at peak times. People stop to talk and tell us how many accidents are averted involving residents out walking or pets and wildlife that are killed on their roads which are never reported to the Highways' safety teams as near misses and therefore don't show up in your data. All of this convinces us that traffic calming is needed in our area. Many of us support your policies and do want change.

We recognise that these plans will have objectors. Whilst no traffic should displace from one residential road to another (we accept this as a valid basis for objection), many will simply object to inconvenience, often those who already live on their quiet no through roads. These groups must not be given equal weight when it comes to consultation.

Heidi Alexander the deputy mayor of TFL recently spoke at the National Walking summit. She said that Councils should not plan schemes in ward silos, your Highways officers clearly agree and are sensibly joining up areas to avoid displacement.

But she also said to be clear in consultation what constitutes valid objection and to offer mitigation not binary choices, otherwise your consultation can become toxic and allow those who just don't want any change, or to give up any motoring convenience the strongest voice, and the power to stop improvements which could transform the safety of our neighbourhoods.

I think that her words of advice are wise. For too long motorists have dominated streets which should be politely shared, and possibly just possibly they might even give up a few of their motoring journeys.





## **STATEMENT TO CABINET MEETING 23<sup>RD</sup> JUNE 2021 RE LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS**

### **BY LYNDA LLOYD**

During the pandemic we have heard the term bubbles a lot in relation to how we mix with others. Whilst this was a welcome strategy for many, enabling people access to loved ones it was temporary restrictive measure to cope with a desperate situation. People want to live in freedom, go where they want and mix with people they want.

I am concerned the creation of Liveable Neighbourhoods seems to be on a Bubble principle. Here we are in our cosy neighbourhood, with only our own vehicles imposing on our streets and we will live happily ever after.

BUT..that's not how the real world lives. Outsiders need and want to enter these artificially created bubbles..to work/visit friends/attend church/the doctors/dentists/museums and shops and by restricting access it makes life difficult for outsiders who have legitimate and legal reasons to visit an area. So, the impact is far wider than the immediate community who live within a proposed Liveable Neighbourhood.

Chelsea road is before you tonight to be approved to go to the next stage and this is a good example of an area that has a wide range of users from outside the immediate area.

How does the council propose to consult that set of people, who bring valued and vital trade into that area? I am fearful of the ways the council will consult people as the ability of the council to engage its population in sufficient numbers in recent consultations is woeful.

The figures of levels of engagement in 3 major consultations are between 500 and 2375 .

As Bath's population is 80,00 and Banes 192,000 these numbers are extremely low and the problem is exacerbated when looking at the numbers of disabled people who responded, around 4.5%, when the figure for residents with long term health problems or disability is 16% and who are disproportionately impacted by a LN scheme .

Jacobs document on Liveable Neighbourhoods stresses the importance of engagement with "harder to reach" groups ...older people, unemployed people, families with young children, those with disabilities and those for whom English is not their first language. Even so, I have so far failed to find reference to consultation with those OUTSIDE a proposed Liveable Neighbourhood.

Residents have consultation fatigue from the number of consultations over the last 9 months. Its not good enough to assume that if people are interested they will engage..they need to know what is going on!

Perhaps we can learn from Charles Booth who surveyed EVERY household in London to find out the levels of poverty. Even in 1889 the population of London was greater than the entire population of Banes so properly surveying people MUST be possible, given sufficient will. Cost is a factor but, the cost of removing such infrastructure is huge.

Please consider a mailshot to all addresses as was done advising of the start of the Clean Air Zone to ensure people are informed directly rather than expecting residents to read the Banes website or the local paper.

The Local authority has a clear responsibility to ensure the information is brought TO the public rather than expecting them to fetch it themselves.

## **Cabinet 23 June 2021 - Patrick Rotheram speaking notes on Liveable Neighbourhoods**

I'm speaking for Vineyards Residents' Association. We're close to the city centre, but in Walcot Ward. The Paragon opposite is Grade 1 Listed while Vineyards is Grade 2. Paragon is mainly multi-occupancy houses, many social housing, and has some of the highest residential density in Bath. 1,000 people live along this stretch of road, which is already heavily congested and polluted.

We've been very worried about a Camden Low Traffic Neighbourhood.

Stopping a large number of vehicles using Camden would displace traffic onto London Road and thence to Paragon and the central area. The Clean Air Plan is already right on the margin and increased traffic on this route would probably push it over the edge. More traffic congestion and longer journeys would increase emissions.

So we're relieved that you are being recommended to approve a 'small scale scheme' for Kensington Gardens and Snow Hill. However, even a smaller scheme is likely to displace traffic and will need to be assessed very carefully.

It seems to be an article of faith for the Council that LTNs will reduce traffic. Certainly, they should reduce traffic in the favoured areas. But why should this 'force down overall traffic levels' without a plan to discourage traffic from entering or passing through Bath, or to improve bus services for drivers to transfer to? In reality, most drivers won't give up their cars. Traffic will be displaced from LTNs onto the 'main roads', which mainly consist of densely residential streets which already suffer from high levels of traffic congestion and air pollution.

Bath needs a transport plan, including traffic management and parking control, to reduce the overall volume of traffic coming into and through the city.

Introducing LTNs in Bath without one is like squeezing a balloon – reduce

traffic in one area, and it will come out somewhere else. Increased congestion may deter some drivers, but that hardly counts as a plan.

We have asked for traffic calming measures such as a 20 mph limit and permanent resident parking on Paragon, enforcing the HGV weight limit, and a pedestrian crossing at the unsafe junction of Paragon and Lansdown. But mainly, through traffic needs to be reduced with a city centre LTN. This isn't a wild idea. Your top level policies, the Local Plan and the Bath Transport Strategy, call for reduced traffic in the historic centre. What is crazy is allowing a main road through the heart of the WHS, dividing the centre and spoiling one of Bath's most iconic spaces, Queen Square. It should be undesignated as a through route. It's a challenge, but I urge you to rise to it. Our great city deserves no less.

Good evening.

Having spoken in a general context about LTNs at last Cabinet, it is great to this evening have the opportunity for Cabinet to agree and hopefully sign-off a process which could lead to implementation of a number of major environmental and life-style improvements for our city.

The debate about the "Liveable Neighbourhoods Strategy" has never been merely about changes in traffic flows and overall traffic management but rather about a vision of how we could make a positive difference to our city, its residents, its visitors and as a consequence to its businesses and local economy. A 'greener', more attractive city will help in differentiating Bath from many other UK cities in a positive way. I, therefore, would URGE Cabinet to support tonight's "Liveable Neighbourhoods" proposals.

We should also recognise that a number of applicants, who may have put forward Liveable Neighbourhood proposals, may be disappointed in their omission from the "Phase 1" process. Those omissions, for areas which are still in need of significant traffic improvements ( such as, for example, Camden Road ) place an even greater responsibility on the initial phase of LTNs.....to get it right and for Council to address other areas issues ASAP.

Aspects of the "Liveable Neighbourhoods Strategy", such as residents parking and the linked recent consultation process are equally important. Here, there are likely to need to be differing solutions for different parts of our city.

My own CARA catchment area has just 12.5% residents-only parking out of approximately 400 total bays! The impact of hotelier/guesthouse/holiday-let parking is considerable in both my own area and that of some of my neighbouring RAs.

Remedies, such as encouraging hoteliers and guesthouses to use general car parks where they are available, such as Charlotte Street car park, should be strongly encouraged to relieve the pressure on residents and disabled parking.

This is just one other example of delivering a meaningful "Liveable Neighbourhoods Strategy". We as 'advocates' are all in this together.....please pass tonight's proposals and let's all now ensure we get it right!

I want to share with the cabinet my experience as a mother of a severely asthmatic child; I am hoping that I can share my experience briefly and then briefly deliver my views of LTNs. I hope that my input can be received with respect and sensitivity as it touches on a very trying time in my life.

I am a mother of three, including twin girls who were premature. One of my daughters suffered a collapsed lung soon after birth, and in her first 18 months she was repeatedly hospitalised for bronchiolitis. We gave her an inhaler around the clock, including at times in the middle of the night to try to keep her lungs clear. We surmised that the air quality in London was really harming her, notwithstanding the fact that we lived on a blocked off street with no through traffic, part of London's "cycle superhighway." We also did not own a car, but we did use black taxis to get around including to attend her various hospital appointments. I am pleased to say that, since moving to Bath, she has not had another episode that has resulted in hospitalisation and we now hardly use her inhaler. We do, however, have a car now and car journeys are a part of life even as we walk as much as we can, including to school and nursery. I note that her breathing is worse on busy roads; a prime example is the playground in Victoria Park!

I understand that the council and particularly the liberal democrat party has an agenda to reduce traffic overall, to promote active travel, and to promote clean air initiatives. I have some scepticism that "liveable neighbourhoods" with roads closed to through traffic will be an effective tool for these measures, and I am concerned that it will create further rifts and divides in our community as indeed I already see them doing. Traffic does not "evaporate", and certainly it doesn't in a city like Bath that is often rainy and incredibly hilly. We did not own a car in London but we do here; I could not take my children to enjoy the activities, the escapes out of the city and at times the journey to school without it. I have explored car pools with other parents - there are several good reasons why they do not work. I fear that this policy seeks to penalise drivers rather than incentivise "green" behaviour with positive reinforcement. I have witnessed division in the parts of London I used to call home as low traffic zones were implemented, and I foresee congestion, aggravation and bad feeling if they are implemented here. Everyone I hear promote these schemes wants to live in an LTN, but no one wants "other people's" traffic. My own view is that Bath residents live in a city and must accept that this comes with traffic; we are not a little village or out in the countryside. I really feel that this plan is flawed; just because there is money given for something like this doesn't mean it is a good idea. I would love to hear more about school buses, better public transport, increasing use of the park and ride and incentivising residents to own only one vehicle. With more people working from home, perhaps fewer families need two cars - this could go a long way

to helping parking issues. I also wonder why we do not have car clubs or promote use of taxis; that is how we tackle the need for a second car when it arises.

I also fear that this scheme is promoted at the expense of business as it complicates visits to Bath. Sometimes I feel that residents here don't want people visiting our beautiful city. If you feel that way, why live somewhere like Bath? On the few occasions where I have voiced my scepticism about LTNs (always in very measured tones), I have been lambasted; one person decried "car-centric parents"; another very vocal proponent of active travel who you probably all know told me that when I was taking my daughter to hospital in a car in London I was "part of the problem." There is a distinct lack of compassion in these conversations and it is pretty repellant!



## STARTS

People voted for the Liberal Democrats in 2019 because they believed that they would take the bold decisions needed to lead B&NES out of years of inaction and predatory delay. Residents were assured that the Lib Dems were committed to delivering on their manifesto promises.

As Councillor for Lambridge I welcome the positive news that the Liveable Neighbourhood policy will now be taken forward. These transformational schemes require consistent messaging about how streets should be safer, healthier, and greener and that they belong to all of us, not just motorists.

The Active Travel Consultation shows just how much many residents want better cycle infrastructure. This consultation had a response from over 2300 residents. With all schemes receiving a majority thumbs up.

But this new Cabinet has decided not to implement the bus gate on North Road. This will give ammunition to the few who will actively oppose Liveable Neighbourhoods. Those who do not want change, will at every opportunity remind this Cabinet that they gave up on North Road because a few local residents objected. This will make Liveable neighbourhoods so much harder to deliver.

North Road is the one route that would have really met the Government strategic network guidelines, and provided the most positive, safe and enduring outcome for many, from 12 years olds getting to school, students and staff attending University, locals accessing sports facilities or residents connecting with family and friends. That this is no longer going to happen brings into question the Councils corporate duty of care.

The reason why many do not cycle or let their children cycle is that they are afraid. Afraid of vehicles and how those vehicles could easily injure or kill them.

When proper dedicated cycle infrastructure is built then people of all ages cycle.

Connecting the valley floor to the southern plateau in Bath via North Road would have created a safe route for many and been a gamechanger. Joanna

This cabinet has now purposely decided to over-engineer the Upper Bristol Road scheme so that they can argue that there is no funding for a bus gate on North Road. Cabinet are now using greenwashing and a hand-picked citizen's assembly as a way of avoiding the delivery of the strategic network. I cannot support this action.

The core values of this new Cabinet seem to be based upon votes not lives. Listening to a select handful of voices to gain tactile votes rather than delivering positive change for all. I can no longer be a member of a group whose moral compass is so compromised and I am tendering my resignation of the Liberal Democrat Party. I will now be representing the ward of Lambridge as a Green Party member.

Bold actions are needed at a time of emergencies. The pandemic gave us the choice to make positive changes like North Road, but this cabinet choose to sabotage a scheme which would have provided safer, healthier travel for residents. We are in a Climate emergency and every action to mitigate change is needed today. This Cabinet has failed to grasp the "fierce urgency of now".

## ENDS

This page is intentionally left blank

On behalf of some residents

Dear Cabinet Members

We are writing to you with respect to the parking situation around Chelsea Road.

Our family live on Park Road. The situation with respect to parking is currently untenable and is significantly negatively impacting the residents in this area.

In the absence of parking restrictions, the community is subject to non-residents parking in order to access the shops on Chelsea Road, in order to work at or attend the nearby hospital, in order to park for the day and head into the city centre to work or shop, and even on occasion to park for a number of weeks in order to catch the airport bus to Bristol airport.

In other words, the absence of parking restrictions has made the local area a car park. On numerous occasions we have been unable to find a parking space when returning from dropping off our daughter at school or when returning with her at the end of the school day. On occasion we have had to drive around the block for half an hour in order to find a space.

Additionally, those using the shops on Chelsea Road often park on double yellow lines and halfway up the pavement, causing jams and a generally dangerous environment for other road users and pedestrians alike.

There is a widely held view among ourselves, our neighbours, and those other residents we have had communications with that the quality of life of those living in the area is drastically reduced because of this situation. In light of the fact that a vote has already taken place in favour of bringing in parking restrictions, I implore the council to act with all haste to remedy this wholly unsatisfactory situation and implement parking restrictions and traffic flow measures to mitigate the worst of these effects as a matter of urgency.

I believe that such restrictions will actually benefit the Chelsea road businesses as it would free up spaces used by those who park to work or travel for potential patrons. I am happy for such restrictions to allow a limited number of hours of parking without a permit in order to avoid detrimental consequences to local businesses. I believe it is only a matter of time before there is an accident without measures being taken. I also believe that everyone should be able to park within a reasonable distance of their own home, especially the elderly and those with children. I believe a failure to act expeditiously will be a dereliction of the council's duty to this community.